



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,793	09/12/2003	Chi-An Kao	TS01-1037	8353
8933	7590	01/03/2006	EXAMINER	
DUANE MORRIS, LLP IP DEPARTMENT 30 SOUTH 17TH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-4196			NGUYEN, KHIEM D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2823	

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/661,793

Applicant(s)

KAO ET AL.

Examiner

Khiem D. Nguyen

Art Unit

2823

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 19 December 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).


4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: 12-14.
Claim(s) objected to: none.
Claim(s) rejected: 8-11.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____


MARK NEW SMITH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

K.N.
December 29, 2005

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment changing the scope of independent 8 raised new issues (i.e., "obtaining a critical dimension measurement of said opening...and assuring that said critical dimension measurement is within design specification") requiring further consideration and new search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants contend that the reference Wu et al. (U.S. Pub. 2005/0042523) herein known as Wu does not teach or suggest the claimed feature of obtaining CD (critical dimension) measurements of the opening created through the layer of etch resist (i.e., photoresist) material.

In response to Applicants' contention that Wu does not teach or suggest the claimed feature of obtaining CD (critical dimension) measurements of the opening created through the layer of etch resist (i.e., photoresist) material, Examiner respectfully submits that Applicants' argument is moot since Applicants' argument relies on the proposed amendment which has not been entered (see explanation in Continuation of 3 above).

Additionally, Applicants also contend that the Examiner's alternative 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection based on Lymberopoulos et al. (U.S. Pub. 2004/0092047) herein known as Lymberopoulos does not disclose "means, including a feedback mechanism for obtaining a critical dimension measurement of said opening created through said layer of etch resist material and assuring that said critical dimension measurement is within design specification".

In response to Applicants' contention that Lymberopoulos does not disclose "means, including a feedback mechanism for obtaining a critical dimension measurement of said opening created through said layer of etch resist material and assuring that said critical dimension measurement is within design specification", Examiner respectfully submits that this argument contended by the Applicants is also moot since Applicants' argument relies on the proposed amendment which has not been entered.

Lymberopoulos does teach Applicants' claimed invention as recited in original claims submitted by the Applicants on July 6th, 2005. Specifically, Lymberopoulos discloses means, including a feedback mechanism, for assuring that the opening created through the layer of etch resist material is within design specification (see page 5, paragraph [0043] and page 6, paragraph [0054], Lymberopoulos).

For this reason, Examiner holds the rejection proper.